DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 444 RC 016 076

AUTHOR Heim, John M.; Wilson, Alfred P.
TITLE Situational Factors Contributing to Administrator Turnover in Small Kansas School Districts and High Schools.
PUB DATE 30 Jan 87
NOTE 46p.; For related documents, see ED 252 338-339. Paper presented at the United School Administrators Conference (Wichita, KS, January 30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Boards of Education; Community Characteristics; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Mobility; Faculty Workload; Organizational Climate; *Persistence; *Principals; Relocation; Salaries; Small Schools; *Superintendents; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas; *Small School Districts

ABSTRACT

A study of turnover among high school superintendents and principals in small Kansas school districts found differences in demographic and organizational characteristics, performance measures, and administrators' perceptions in districts with high and low turnover rates. Data obtained from 72 administrator interviews and educational directories and state salary/financial reports discovered differences in workload and support personnel, number of attendance centers, teacher relations, salaries, community location, school board stability, and wealth per pupil. Qualities of low turnover schools/districts included presence of assistant superintendents, administrators' perceptions of their salaries as above average, good community location, more centralization, administrators' positive attitude toward workload and satisfaction with others in workplace, better teacher-administrator relations, and teachers perceived by administrators as better paid than teachers in other districts. Qualities of high turnover schools/districts included superintendents serving simultaneously as principals, reelection of school board president after previous defeat, more attendance centers, more problems with teacher relations, more wealth per pupil, more isolated communities, past administrator incompetence, good training ground for a better job. The study compares results with other reported research and points out implications for small school districts seeking to reduce administrative turnover and for administrators seeking employment. (LFL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279444

SITUATIONAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO ADMINISTRATOR TURNOVER IN SMALL KANSAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

by

John M. Heim
Lawrence Public Schools, Lawrence Kansas

and

Alfred P. Wilson
Kansas State University, Manhattan Kansas

A Paper presented to the United School Administrators Wichita Kansas January 30, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alfred P. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC016076

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Job turnover is a phenomenon that is present in any enduring organization. This turnover has been the subject of countless studies in business and industry, and more recently has received attention in the educational literature.

Public school administrator turnover was the topic of a review of literature done by Burlingame (1977). Burlingame placed the yearly turnover rate for superintendents at about 20%. Typical tenure was reported at approximately five to six years. In a similar study, C.M. Smith (1981p.1) concluded that superintendent's job security has shown decline.

Miskel and Cosgrove (1985) wentfurther with their contentions regarding administrator change in schools. They described the turnover of superintendents and principals as a "disruptive event," one that changes communication, power structures, decision-making, and general equilibrium.

A study concentrating on turnover in rural Kansas schools revealed that a yearly turnover rate for the past six years was 13% for superintendents and 20% for high school principals (Wilson, 1985). This study also determined that superintendent and principal job changes were increasing. Data indicated a markedly higher rate of change from 1981 to 1984 than for the prior three years.

Purpose of the Study

This study was undertaken primarily to gain a better understanding of administrator turnover in Kansas schools. More specifically, small school districts with a high rate of superintendent and/or high school principal change for the past ten years were compared with those that exhibit a low rate. The research investigated differences and similarities of the high and low turnover groups.

This purpose was realized through identifying, comparing, and contrasting districts and high schools that experienced unusual amounts of turnover, unusual being defined as either very high or very low turnover.

The general hypothesis for this study, stated in the null form, was that no significant difference exists between school districts with high rates of turnover and those that maintained low rates. These differences were investigated with regard to: 1)Demographic characteristics, 2)Organizational characteristics, 3)Performance measures, and 4)Perceptions of administrators.

Methodology

Districts used in this study were selected based upon administrator turnover rates. High and low turnover are relative terms defined using data from a pilot study conducted on small Kansas school districts (Wilson, 1985).

Districts with four or more superintendent job changes over a ten year period were labeled high superintendent turnover and districts with five or more high school principal job changes over a ten year period were labeled high principal turnover. The same procedure was used for selection of low turnover groups, but based upon the least number of job changes.

Administrators in these districts/schools were contacted via telephone and asked to participate in the study by providing verbal comment into their district/school turnover rates and possible causes. They also provided information regarding situational factors in their districts/schools. In the case of high turnover districts/schools, attempts were made to contact both current and past administrators. Only current administrators were contacted in low turnover positions.

This interview data was written into narrative, compiled, and the different research groups were compared. Frequencies related in the interviews were compared for statistical significance using chi square analysis when appropriate.

Data to supplement the interview data were collected from educational directories, state salary reports, and state financial reports. These data were analyzed using t-tests for independent samples when in continuous form and z-tests when in the form of percents or proportions. Chi square analysis was used when the data were in the form of frequencies.

The .10 level was considered significant. the increased risk of Type II error was accepted due to the exploratory nature of the study and small sample size.

The Population

The population selected for research was all Kansas Public School districts limited by the following factors: 1) Districts with total enrollments exceeding 1500 students were not

included; and 2) Districts with total enrollments less than 200 students were not included. The upper limit of the population eliminated fifty-two of 304 Kansas school districts (17%) while the lower limit eliminated thirty-two (11%). These population constraints also eliminated the majority of districts that employed superintendents as K-12 principals.

Districts with high rates of superintendent and/or high school principal job change were selected for comparison with districts with low rates of high school principal and/or superintendent job change.

High turnover districts for superintendents were defined as those experiencing four or more changes over the past ten years. High turnover for high school principals was limited to those with five or more job changes over the past ten years. Six districts had both high principal and high superintendent turnover. Twelve districts were defined as having had high superintendent turnover only. Twelve different districts had high high school principal turnover.

Thirty different schools or districts had either high superintendent turnover, high principal turnover, or both. A total of fourteen districts

that had high superintendent turnover were examined. Fifteen different high schools were examined. One chose not to participate.

Low superintendent and high school principal turnover were those that had no change in these positions over the ten years of the study. Sixteen districts met this criteria for both superintendent and high school principal. Fourteen different districts that had low turnover were contacted. This represented sixteen different high schools. Two chose not to participate.

Instrumentation

Data for this study were gathered through two means: telephone interview and acturarial data. Subjective and objective data garnered through telephone interview were reinforced and built upon with data from Kansas State Department of Education salary and financial reports, newspapers, and Kansas State Department of Education and Kansas State High School Activities Association directories.

Telephone interviews were conducted in an attempt to gain first hand knowledge of the school districts being compared. An interview guide was developed for the purpose of developing a format, and

standardizing response recording, for the interview

Questions were developed to obtain objective and Subjective information from participants. These questions focused on situational characteristics of the school districts and allowed subjects to extrapolate on those characteristics relationship to the turnover rates of their districts.

Theguide was reviewed by two administrators and two professors prior to being used to insure that the questions were clear as to content, purpose, and wording.

Data Collection and Procedures

Telephone interviews were conducted from May, 1985 through March, 1986. These interviews lasted between five and twenty-five minutes and were done at various times during the day. Interviews were conducted on different days during the work week (Monday through Friday).

The researcher called, stated his name and purpose then asked if the subject would allow the call to be taped to allow for better reproduction of the data. Sixty-three percent of the interviews were recorded. Some subjects objected and

their feelings were honored. When the calls were not recorded, the researcher scribed the information related by the respondent. All subjects were assured that neither their names, nor the names of the districts being researched would be released by the researcher. Several subjects asked to be re-assured of this fact during the course of the interview.

The interviews were conducted using the interview guide to provide structure but the respondents were allowed to control the course and direction of the interview. Subjects were encouraged to provide information beyond what was specifically asked and determined the progression of the questions as they volunteered information. Many callers gave either brief or no attention to several areas of the guide, preferring to focus on their specific ideas or concerns. By allowing this freedom of response, characteristics which were not included on the interview guide also surfaced and were described.

As a conclusion to the interview, subjects were asked to describe why they felt that their school district exhibited the amount of turnover that it did.

A total of 72 interviews were conducted during the course of the study. Some members of the sample

could not be located, thus were not contacted. In every case, missing subjects were past administrators of the sample districts. These missing subjects were determined to be retired, working out of the state, or no longer working as school administrators.

Additional data were gathered to supplement that gained in the interviews. Kansas State Department of Education provided teacher and principal salary information, financial data, number of attendance centers, number of communities served, and enrollment data. The Topeka Capital Journal was researched to obtain samples of athletic success and Kansas State Department of Education and Kansas State High School Activities Association directories listed presence of support personnel and board of education president turnover. The Kansas State Department of Education provided minimum competency test results and the University of Kansas School of Education provided standardized results of these results that were comparable over time.

Method of Analysis

Variables of interest were organized into groups for the purpose of standardizing the research.

Demographics, organizational variables, and performance composed the groups.

Demographic factors included district finances and enrollment, school board characteristics, and community characteristics. Community characteristics investigated were participants 'perception of isolation, and descriptions of the community.

School board characteristics researched were age, tenure, gender, and occupation of members. The turnover rates for school board presidents were also used as an objective characteristic.

Wealth per pupil and general perception of the respondent were the financial measures used. Subjects perception of financial status and actual financial data from the state department were collected.

Enrollment was a measure of organizational size. Actual enrollment was provided by the educational directories. Perceptions of size and change in numbers of students were also investigated.

Demographic aspects were considered significant if the subjects perceived them to be better or worse than other school districts and if a fluctuation occurred that may have related to turnover.

Subjective data were compared for significant differences between the high and low turnover groups.

Organizational factors that were researched consisted of support personnel, workload/job demand, labor-management relations, and teacher and administrator salaries.

Support personnel factors included presence of certified or uncertified assistants and the respondents' perceptions regarding the necessity of assistants. Educational directories provided objective data regarding the presence of support personnel.

Workload/job demand factors researched were any duties that were perceived to be out of the ordinary and/or any increase in the responsibilities of the job. Data regarding number of towns with attendance centers and number of attendance centers served by one principal or superintendent were gathered from educational directories.

Perceived problems with negotiations, status of teacher relations, and changes in the status of relations were studied to provide information on labor-management relations. Principals and superintendents gave their perceptions of the importance of this area to turnover.

The final area of organizational data was salaries. Respondents gave their perceptions of teacher and administrator salaries in their districts and whether these factors were related to the turnover rate of their district. State department salary studies provided additional salary data.

Organizational factors were considered significant if the respondents considered them important to turnover or different from other school districts. Objective data was considered significant if there was a significant difference between the high and low turnover groups.

Performance factors were divided into two groups. Academic performance data were gathered in the form of perceptions of student scores on standardized tests, importance of academics to turnover, and changes in the level of performance. In addition to the subjective data, Kansas state competency test results were compiled.

Co-curricular performance was studied in terms of respondents perceptions of performance in sports and/or activities, importance to turnover, and changes in the level of performance. Objectively, football win/loss records for the districts were gathered.

The data collected were analyzed using either chi squares, z-tests, or t-tests. Data from the interviews was in the form of frequencies and was therefore analyzed using chi squares. The supplemental data were analyzed using chi squares if they were in the form of frequencies, t-tests for independent samples if in continuous form, and z-tests if in the form of percentages or proportions.

The .10 level was used to determine the significance of differences between groups. This higher p value increases the possibility of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is fact true. This increased probability of Type II error was considered acceptable due to the small sample size and the exploratory nature of the study.

Summary of results

Using the .10 level of significance, several areas were significantly different between the high and low turnover groups. These differences, reported by group, follow with a summary of the results also being provided in table 5.1.

Organizational factors that were found to be significantly different included presence of

assistants, superintendent serving simultaneously as principal, perceptions of teacher relations, and perceptions of salaries. Low superintendent turnover districts were more likely to have assistant superintendents than high turnover districts. Superintendents in districts where they were required to serve simultaneously as principals had high turnover.

Teacher relations were perceived to be better in the high turnover groups than in the low turnover groups. This was true of principals and superintendents.

The difference in perceptions was also present with regard to administrator and teacher salaries. Principals and superintendents from low turnover schools/districts perceived their salaries as above average in significantly more cases than those from high turnover schools/districts. This difference was not significant when the actual salaries were analyzed.

Demographic factors that achieved significance were community location and re-election of board presidents after defeat. Community location was described as good (or not isolated) in more cases in the low turnover groups than in the high turnover

groups. Re-election of board president after they had been previously defeated occurred more often in the high turnover districts than in the low. One performance factor was significantly different. In the high principal turnover group, more principals left their jobs in years of losing football programs than in years of winning programs.

Summary of the Results in Terms of the Literature

This study investigated the amount of workload and support personnel in the two groups as a possible factor contributing to the amount of turnover experienced by the districts. One area proved significantly different between the two groups and several others produced results that were notable.

Workload and support personnel

Districts where the superintendent had an assistant had lower turnover than those that did not. The superintendent results were not consistent with research concerning centralization in organizations. Organizational research determined that centralization was a negative correlate of turnover.

Table 5.1 Summary of Statistical Test Results

	Comparison groups	
Organizational factors	**Superintendents**	**Principals**
Presence of assistants	**	
Superintendent serves as principal	*	
Perception of teacher relations	*	***
Salaries		
Actual teacher		
Perceived teacher	*	**
Actual administrator		
Perceived administrator	*	**
Demographic factors		
Enrollment		
Community location	***	*
Board president turnover		
Re-election of board presidents (after being defeated)	*	
Performance		
Competency tests		
Perceived academic		
Football wins per year		
Principals leaving in winning or losing years		*
Perceived co-curricular		

*** = Significant difference at .01 level
** = Significant difference at .05 level
* = Significant difference at .10 level

More assistants would decrease the amount of centralization and thus should increase turnover. This was not the case in the results determined for superintendents in this study. There was no

significant difference in turnover between schools that had assistant principals and those that did not.

Also related to centralization was the number of attendance centers and number of communities with attendance centers. The results of this study were in agreement with the literature in this area. The two variables showed more centralization in the low turnover districts than in the high turnover districts.

Workload was not a subject addressed in the turnover literature but it did prove to be an area of difference between high and low turnover groups. The difference did not occur with the actual amount of work expected, rather it was with the attitude of the respondent in the different districts. Principals and superintendents from the low turnover group expressed their attitude toward workload in positive terms whereas the high turnover group members either did not mention it or were concerned with negative aspects of the job.

The presence of assistants has already been mentioned as an aspect of centralization. It also impacts the workload of principals and superintendents. The difference between

superintendent groups was significantly different but the difference between principal groups was not.

One workload area that was mentioned by superintendents was having to serve simultaneously as principal. The number of occurrences in the high turnover districts was more than in the low turnover districts The difference was significant at the .10 level.

An aspect of school districts that was mentioned with regard to centralization, and affects workload, was number of attendance centers. Districts in the high superintendent turnover group had more attendance centers. This was mentioned by superintendents as a problem with workload.

Several studies in the turnover literature focused on some aspect of integration and satisfaction with co-workers, subordinates, or superiors. Satisfaction with others in the workplace wasa significant predictor of turnover in the literature. This was also true in the school districts investigated in this study.

Teacher/administrator relations

Teacher/administrator relations were an aspect of integration that were found to be different in the

comparison groups at the .10 level. Principals and superintendents in high turnover districts perceived problems with relations significantly more often than those in low turnover districts.

Fultz's (1976) research determined that lack of teacher respect for the superintendent was a cause of turnover. Lack of respect could be related to the poor relations present in the high turnover districts.

School boards

Research conducted by Fultz (1976) found weak rapport with the board to contribute to superintendent turnover. This was supported by the fact that superintendents from both high and low turnover groups mentioned the necessity of a good board.

Negotiations

The presence of a strong union and the difficulties involved with negotiations were often discussed in conjunction with the status of teacher relations. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found the presence of an industry union to be a predictor of turnover of union members and potential union members. They did not study turnover of their supervisors. The teachers' association and

negotiations were mentioned by administrators as potential problems that could lead to turnover. In one district, it was a primary cause according to the principals who had left. Only one administrator felt that negotiations had decreased tensions between teachers and administrators.

Negotiations were mentioned by Fultz (1976) in his research. He determined that for a superintendent to be a poor negotiator could lead to turnover. Being a poor negotiator could also lead to poor relations and problems with negotiations.

Salaries

Salaries were another aspect of the organization that were prominent in the turnover research. This study found no significant difference between the groups with regard to actual salary. While the average salaries for administrators in the low turnover group were higher in three of the four years studied, the differences were not significant due to the large variance in both groups.

Administrator's perceptions of their salaries did not hold with the statistical analysis of their actual salaries. Principals in the low turnover group ranked their salaries differently (higher) than those in high turnover groups significantly more

times ($p>.10$). Superintendent perceptions were similar to principals. These results were supported by the findings of Motowildo (1983) and Bartol (1979) in their research on the importance of satisfaction with pay. The low turnover administrators ranked their pay levels higher even though they may not have been. This implies that they were experiencing more satisfaction with pay than those in the high turnover districts.

Teacher salaries were also investigated in this study and similar results were obtained. Teacher salaries were higher in the low turnover districts but the differences were not large enough to be significant.

Superintendent perceptions of teacher salaries were significantly different at the .10 level. Differences for principal's perceptions were also significant at the .10 level. The administrators in the low turnover districts perceived their teacher to be paid better than those in the high turnover districts.

Enrollment

Enrollment was investigated as a measure of organizational size and fluctuation. There were no differences between the two groups with regard to

size or enrollment fluctuation. The existing literature regarding organizational size was not conclusive. Burlingame (1977) and Bluedorn (1982) contended that the relationship was curvilinear, with Burlingame's contention being rooted in research on superintendents. If this were the case the lack of a significant difference in this dissertation's results could be due to controls placed on the size of the sample districts.

Stability and average daily attendance were established as predictors of incumbent defeat and therefore superintendent turnover by Walden (1976). This was not supported by this study. Fultz (1976) identified enrollment size as a factor in superintendent turnover but only in districts of a particular (large) size.

Financial status

A demographic characteristic of school districts that was different for the two groups was financial status as measured by wealth per pupil. The districts in the high principal and superintendent turnover group had more wealth per pupil than those in the low turnover districts. This was in conflict with Pfeffer and Moore's (1981) research that

determined turnover to be less when resources were "slack".

Two studies in the literature found two different financial measures were related to turnover. Burlingame (1977) identified per-pupil valuations as a possible predictor of turnover. Berger (1984) found per-pupil expenditure was a predictor of turnover in districts with enrollment decline.

Community characteristics

Another demographic variable that was investigated was location. A significant difference was noted for both superintendents and principals perceptions in this area. This was consistent with Pettman's (1973) research on environmental facts that relate to turnover. He found geographic location to be a significant predictor of turnover.

The concept of location also relates to the literature in the area of integration. Principals and superintendents described locations in terms of the degree of isolation, with more isolated generally implying a poor location. Datcher's (1983) results concerning informal networks could be used to partially explain the problem of isolation. The more

isolated a district is, the less opportunity for informal networks.

Young (1984) and Haughey and Murphy (1983) stressed the importance of interpersonal relationships with colleagues and peers as a determinate of satisfaction and turnover in education settings. Again, a more isolated location would limit the chances for such contact for principals or superintendents and their true peers (other principals and superintendents).

A final contention regarding location and isolation as it relates to turnover was offered by Smith (1981). Her conclusion was that superintendents move to districts that "fit" them better. This was supported by the principals and superintendents descriptions of communities in this study. Low turnover administrators described their communities in positive terms in the majority of cases and spoke of how much they liked their locations in a significant number of cases. The opposite was true of administrators from high turnover districts.

Berger's (1984) research on districts with declining enrollments supports community relations as a predictor of turnover for superintendents.

Administrators from both high and low turnover groups in this study acknowledged the importance of having a good match between person and community.

Extensive research on community unrest and board turnover has been conducted or reported by Iannaconne and Lutz (Iannaconne & Lutz, 1969; & Lutz & Iannaconne, 1978). Board president turnover was not significantly different between the high and low turnover groups. There was a difference in the number of times that board presidents were re-elected to the presidency after not serving for at least one year. This was an indication of some fluction in the power structure in those boards in which it occurred.

The importance of incumbent defeat was also stressed by Iannocanne and Lutz. This importance was mentioned by only one superintendent in this study.

Performance

The final area of investigation in this study was performance. Competency tests showed consistently higher results in the low turnover districts but the difference was not significant. There was no significant difference in the way administrators perceived performance in their districts. Administrators did believe that this area could be very important to turnover.

Co-curricular performance was assessed by perceptions of administrators and football records. No significant differences were found in this area either. One measure, the number of principals that left their jobs in years of winning football records versus those who left in years of losing seasons, achieved significance at the .10 level. Thus more principals may leave when the teams do not do well.

Administrators placed some importance on this area indicating that good co-curricular programs could lead to better all around years. Their assessments of performance in their districts were not significantly different. Administrators from both studies related the contention that over emphasis of an activity could lead to problems and were a potential cause of turnover.

Although firm/company performance was the subject of extensive research in the turnover literature, the results were inconclusive. The importance is validated but the relationship is difficult to establish. Miskel and Owens (1984) found no support for school effectiveness and administrator turnover.

Individual performance was also addressed in the literature in a way that relates to this study.

Wagner et al. (1984) and Jackofsky (1984) anticipated that turnover could be predicted from individual performance and occurred at different rates for different levels of performance. This theory can be used to clarity some of the responses given in this study.

In the high turnover districts, one of two reasons was frequently given for the high rate of turnover. Five districts with high principal turnover had incompetence of past administrators given as a cause of the high turnover at least once. Seven districts that had high superintendent turnover and four that had high principals were described as good training grounds from which good people went on to better jobs.

These results tend to mesh with Jackofsky's contentions. Good administrators were attracted to the training ground districts and only stayed if they were extremely satisfied with the conditions of employment there. Poor or incompetent administrators would have the highest turnover rate and it would be the least affected by satisfaction with their position as they would be pushed out of their jobs. The question left unanswered by this research is what

distinguishes a "training ground" district from a district that attracts incompetents.

Some explanations were touched upon by administrators. Poor screening by the board, salaries, location, and poor hiring practices were all possible causes. Fultz (1976) supported this when he listed board candidate review as a predictor of turnover.

The contentions of Jackofsky (1984) were similar to the contentions of Carlson (1961) that were built upon by Burlingame (1977). Three categories of superintendents were delineated. Placebound superintendents were motivated to stay in the position that they held. This category defines the low turnover superintendents and principals in this study. Career-bound superintendents moved from place to place to increase their salary or prestige.

This second category, career-bound, were further broken down into place holders and those that moved from job to job in a horizontal fashion. Only two of forty-three superintendents in this study moved vertically to jobs with more prestige or better salaries.

The place holders would explain the administrators in this study that moved from

districts of similar size to districts of similar size. The career-bound administrators would be those who were employed in the "training ground districts" that moved on to better jobs. Again the unanswered question of why certain districts attract the different types partially remains.

Uses for the study

The results of this study can be applied to small school districts in two ways. First, from the perspective of administrators who are either seeking employment or are currently employed and second, to employers who are seeking to change the amount of turnover by their superintendents or high school principals.

Administrators can use these results either to analyze current or future turnover possibility in their current positions, or to assess the turnover possibilities of employment opportunities. In making these analyses or assessments, several findings of this study can be used.

In the area of organizational variables, administrators should look into workload and presence of support personnel. Workload is particularly important to superintendents from the perspectives of the number of attendance centers served by the

district and whether or not there was the requirement of serving simultaneously as principal. The presence of an assistant superintendent was important to low turnover for superintendents but assistant principals were not important to low turnover for high school principals.

Another organizational variable that should be analyzed is that of the status of teacher relations. Low turnover district administrators perceived better than average teacher relations significantly more often than low turnover districts. This indicates that an administrator interested in long tenure should make a priority of teacher relations. This extended into the administrators' perceptions of teacher salaries. Low turnover administrators' perceptions of teacher salaries in their districts were better than those perceptions in high turnover districts and schools.

A final aspect of the organization that bears mention is that of administrator perceptions of their own salaries. Those administrators who perceived their salaries as above average were more often from low than high turnover districts or schools. Their were no significant differences between actual salaries in these districts. These results imply

district and whether or not there was the requirement of serving simultaneously as principal. The presence of an assistant superintendent was important to low turnover for superintendents but assistant principals were not important to low turnover for high school principals.

Another organizational variable that should be analyzed is that of the status of teacher relations. Low turnover district administrators perceived better than average teacher relations significantly more often than low turnover districts. This indicates that an administrator interested in long tenure should make a priority of teacher relations. This extended into the administrators' perceptions of teacher salaries. Low turnover administrators' perceptions of teacher salaries in their districts were better than those perceptions in high turnover districts and schools.

A final aspect of the organization that bears mention is that of administrator perceptions of their own salaries. Those administrators who perceived their salaries as above average were more often from low than high turnover districts or schools. Their were no significant differences between actual salaries in these districts. These results imply

that satisfaction with pay is an important aspect of long tenure for school administrators.

A demographic variable that had a high level of significance for administrators was perception of community location. Administrators that liked the location of their employing district were more prevalent in low turnover districts. This indicates that those administrators who are looking for an extended tenure in a district should give strong consideration to whether or not the district location meets their individual needs.

Board stability as indicated by re-election of board presidents after defeat showed more instability in districts with high superintendent turnover. Board leadership stability is a factor that should be considered by administrators attempting to assess the turnover potential of a position.

A final demographic variable that was different for the two groups was wealth per pupil. Although superintendent and principal perceptions of financial status were not different, wealth per pupil was higher in high turnover districts than low turnover districts. This would seem contrary to popular beliefs that richer districts are more attractive.

Performance measures investigated by this study showed only one significant difference (.10 level) between the two groups. Academic and co-curricular performance levels were not important to turnover according to the findings of this study.

Employers interested in applying the results of this study to their districts should look for characteristics of their districts that fit with those of the different groups in the study. These results could best be applied by a district looking for ways to decrease turnover.

It is important to consider individuals being considered for employment when attempting to use these results. This study was based upon the perceptions of superintendents and principals, then substantiated by actuarial data where possible. Individual-organizational fit is important to formulazation of perceptions. Therefore, individuals being considered should be looked at in terms of their perceptions or probable perceptions of the characteristics of the employing districts.

Variables that proved significantly different and that could be considered by employers were presence of assistants (superintendents only), superintendent serving as principal, perceptions of

teacher relations, perceptions of teacher and administrator salaries, community location, re-election of board presidents (superintendents only), and winning or losing football seasons (principals only).

The above listed variables can all be directly manipulated by employer except community location, re-election of board presidents, and winning or losing football seasons. By choosing a particular type of person, community location can also be manipulated. These results indicate that factors that contribute to superintendent and principal turnover can be changed by districts that would like to change the amount of turnover that they experience.

References

Allen, M. P., Panion, S. K., & Lutz, R. E. (1979). Managerial succession and organizational performance: A recalcitrant problem revisited. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24 (2). 167--180.

Argyris, C. (1973). Personality and organization theory revisited. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18 (1), 141-167.

Armknecht, P. A., & Early, J. F. (1972). Quits in manufacturing: A study of their causes. Monthly Labor Review, 95, 31-37.

Arnold, H. J., Feldman, D. C., & Purbhoo, M. (1985). The role of social-desirability response bias in turnover research. Academy of Management Journal, 28 (4), 955-966.

Ashbaugh, C. R. (1982). What is job satisfaction? Planning and Changing, 13, 195-203.

Bartol, K. M. (1979). Individual versus organizational predictors of job satisfaction and turnover among professionals. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 15 (1), 55-67.

*Berger, M. A. (1984). Predicting succession under conditions of enrollment decline. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20 (2), 93-107.

* Used directly in this paper 36

Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning. In S. Bacharach (Ed.), Research in the sociology of organizations (pp. 75-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brown, M. C. (1982). Administrative succession and organizational performance: The succession effect. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27 Deposition (1), 1-16.

Burlingame, M. E. (1977). An exploratory study of turnover and career mobility. (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 152 462).

Butler, R. P., Lardent, C. L., & Miner, J. B. (1983). A motivational basis for turnover in military officer education and training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (3), 496-506.

Carlson, R. O. (1961). Succession and performance among school superintendents. Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (2), 210-227.

Charters, W. W. (1970). Some factors affecting teacher survival in school districts. American Educational Research Journal, 7, 1-27.

Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. Academy of Management Review, 11 (1), 55-70.

37

Datcher, L. (1983). The impact of informal networks on quit behavior. Review of Economics and Statistics, 65 (3), 491-495.

Dolce, C. (1976). Superintendents under siege: Get the leader. (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 122 362).

Dreher, G. G. (1982). The role of performance in the turnover process. Academy of Management Journal, 25, 137-147.

Eitzen, D. S., & Yetman, N. R. (1972). Managerial change, longevity, and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1), 110-116.

Federico, J. M., Federico, P., & Lundquist, G. W. (1976). Predicting women's turnover as a function of extent of met salary expectations and biodemographical data. Personnel Psychology, 29, 559-566.

Forrest, C. R., Cummings, L. L., & Johnson, A. C. (1977). Organizational participation: A critique and model. Academy of Management Review, 2 (4), 586-601.

Fultz, JD. (1976). Eight ways superintendents lose their jobs. American School Board Journal, 163 (9), 42-51.

Gameson, W. A., & Scotch, N. A. (1964). Scapegoating in baseball. The American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1), 69-72.

Ganz, H. J., & Hoy, W. K. (1977). Patterns of succession of elementary principals and organizational change. Planning and Changing, 8 (2-3), 185--190.

Goodman, P. S., Salipante, P., & Paransky, (1973). Hiring, training, and retraining the hard-core unemployed: A select review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 23-33.

Gorden, G. E., & Rosen, N. (1981). Critical factors in leadership succession. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27, 227-254.

Grusky, O. (1963). Managerial succession and organizational effectiveness. American Journal of Sociology, 69 (1), 21-31.

Haughey, M. L. & Murphy, P. J. (1983). Are rural teachers satisfied with the quality of their work life? Education, 104 (1), 56-66.

Iannaccone, L., & Lutz, F. W. (1969). The governing of local school districts. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

* Jackofsky, E. F. (1984). Turnover and job performance: An integrated process model. Academy of Management Review, 9 (1), 74-83.

Jackofsky, E. F., & Peters, L. H. (1983a). The hypothesized effects of ability in the turnover process. Academy of Management Review, 8 (1), 46-49.

Jackofsky, E. F., & Peters, L. H. (1983b). Job turnover versus company turnover: Reassessment of the March and Simon participation hypothesis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (3), 490-495.

LaRocco, J. M., Pugh, W. M., & Gunderson, E. K. (1977). Identifying determinants of retention decision. Personnel Psychology, 30, 199-215.

Lutz, F. W. (1982). Community conflict and superintendent survival. Planning and Changing, 13 (1), 11-18.

Lutz, F. W., and Iannoccone, L. (1978). Citizen participation in local school districts: The dissatisfaction theory of American democracy. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Mackay, D. I., Boddy, D., Brack, J., Diack, J. A., & Jones, N. (1971). Labor markets. London: Allen

Mangione, T. W. (1973). Turnover: Some Psychological and demographic correlates. In R.

P. Quinn and T. W. Mangione (Eds.), The 1969 survey of working conditions. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Marsh, R., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A predictive study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 57-75.

Martin, T. N., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). Job performance and turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 116-119.

McCain, B. E., O'Reilly, C., & Pfeffer, J. (1983). The effects of departmental demography on turnover: The case of a university. Academy of Management Journal, 26, (4), 626-641.

Miskel, C., & Cosgrove, D. (1985). Leader succession in school settings. Review of Educational Research, 55, (1), 87-105.

Miskel, C., & Owens, M. (1984). Principal succession and changes in school coupling and effectiveness. (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 231 081).

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and

employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62 (2), 237-240.

Mobley, W. H. (1982). Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., and Meglino, B.M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. Psychological Bulletin, 86 (3), 493-522.

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (4), 408-414.

* Motowidlo, S. H. (1983). Predicting sales turnover from pay satisfaction and expectation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (3), 484-489.

Mowday, R. T., & Spencer, D. G. (1981). The influence of task and personality characteristics on employee turnover and absenteeism incidents. Academy of Management Journal, 24 (3) 634-642.

Muchinsky, P., & Tuttle, M. (1979). Employee turnover: An empirical and methodological assessment. Journal of vocational Behavior, 14, 263-290.

* Pettman, B. O. (1973). Some factors influencing labour turnover: A review of the literature. Industrial Relations Journal, 4, 43-61.

Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. (1986). Administrative succession and organizational performance: How administrator experience mediates the succession effect. Academy of Management Journal, 29 (1), 72-83.

* Pfeffer, J., & Moore, W. L. (1980). Average tenure of academic department heads. The effects of paradigm, size, and departmental demography. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25 (3), 387-407.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151-176.

Price, J. L. (1977). The study of turnover. Ames, IA: ISU Press. Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1980). Effects of ownership and performance on executive tenure in U. S. corporations, Academy of Management Journal, 23 (4), 653-664.

Salancik, G. R., Staw, B. M., & Pondy, L. R. (1980). Administrative turnover as a response to

unmanaged organizational interdependence. Academy of Management Journal, 23 (3), 422-437.

Schwab, D. P., & Oliver, R. L. (1974). Predicting turnover with biographical data. Personnel Psychology, 27, 125-128.

Schwartz, K. B., Menon, K. (1985). Executive succession in failing firms. Academy of Management Journal, 28 (3), 680-686.

Smith, C. M. (1981). Attitude congruence and superintendent service: A modest relationship. (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 202 155).

Stahl, M. J., & McNichols, C. W. (1981). Modeling turnover behavior: A comparative analysis of three multivariate turnover models. American Institute for Decision Sciences, 1, 371-373.

Terborg, J. R., & Lee, T. W. (1984). A predictive study of organizational turnover rates. Academy of Management Journal, 27 (4), 793-810.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. (1965-1973). Federal employment statistics bulletin.

Van Der Merwe, R., & Miller, S. (1971). The measurement of labor turnover. Human Relations, 26, 415-432.

Viega, J. F. (1983). Mobility influences during managerial career stages. Academy of Management, 26 (1), 64-85.

*Wagner, G. W., Pfeffer, J., O'Reilly, C. A. (1984). Organizational demography and turnover in top-management groups. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29 74-92.

*Walden, J. (1976). Antecedents to incumbent defeat and superintendent turnover. (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. Ed 119 378).

Waters, L. K., Roach, D., & Waters, C. W. (1976). Estimate of future tenure, satisfaction, and biographical variables as predictors of termination. Personnel Psychology, 29, 57-60.

*Wilson, A. P., & Heim, J. M. (1985). Administrative turnover in Kansas rural school districts: 1978-1984. Research in Rural Education, 3 (1), 19-22.

*Young, I. P. (1984). An examination of job satisfaction for female and male public school superintendents. Planning and Changing, 15 (2), 114-124.